DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 223 HE 005 663

AUTHOR Kliment, Stephen A.; Lord, Jane
TITLE Build If You Must, But Consider...2. Non-Campus Facilities. Planning for Higher Education; Vol. 3; No. 2; April 1974.
INSTITUTION Society for Coll. and Univ. Planning, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Educational Facilities Labs., Inc., New York, N.Y.; National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 4p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Campus Planning; Educational Facilities; Educational Technology; *External Degree Programs; *Facility Planning; *Higher Education; School Community Relationship; Surveys; *University Extension

ABSTRACT

This is the second of seven articles to address the problem of what higher education can do to meet the space needs of new programs and a widened constituency. This article explores the solution of relying actively on noncampus facilities and programs. Many institutions, to answer this problem, have begun to use the dispersed campus, outreach and external degree programs, and new technology. The Educational Facilities Laboratory has checked with 75 institutions that use noncampus facilities and have reponted on them in this article. The solutions are divided into 4 categories: the dispersed campus, operating in several leased or rent-free facilities in the surrounding community; community facilities focused on specific groups in the community, such as the military or prisons; external degree programs, requiring formal facilities; and technology-based outreach programs that transmit education over distances. (Author/PG)

planning for higher education

SCUP

EFL

Vol. 3, No. 2: 2/6 April 1974

Build if you must, but consider...

2 NON-CAMPUS FACILITIES

1 Redeploying Campus Space and Time
3 Modernization
4 Found Space
5 Cooperation
6 Interim Facilities
7 Restructuring College Housing

2

This is the second of seven articles to address the problem of what higher education can do to meet the space needs of new programs and a widened constituency. This article explores the solution of relying actively on non-campus facilities and programs. Institutions have begun to use the dispersed campus, outreach and external degree programs, and new technology. Longer and more varied studies covering seventy-five institutions are available from Educational Facilities Laboratories. Those who are interested in examining these case studies should write EFL, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022, indicating their particular areas of concern. This article and the case studies, compiled for EFL by Jane Lord and Stephen A. Kliment, resulted from a project jointly funded by the National Institute for Education and Educational Facilities Laboratories. Subsequent issues of Planning for Higher Education will carry the remaining articles of this series.

The Issues

The public service function of a university has become a popular topic of debate. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in its 1972 report *The Campus and the City* advocates such a role. But it points up dilemmas. Should the university supply educational programs? Should it merely administer them? Should it also support community activities?

Whatever the answer (and the report is in favor of some kind of liaison agency to oversee programs), the use of facilities in a community, public or private, is a widely used method to combine relief of on-campus space pressures with accommodation of community needs, to provide off-campus experience for traditional students, and to upgrade a community's educational incentives.

The term "community" does not apply solely to a city setting. Many colleges and universities serve areas covering hundreds of square miles that are sparsely populated, but the communities are entitled to full educational services.

To accommodate the potential market for education, which according to a 1973 report of the Commission on Non-Traditional Study (Samuel Gould, Chairman) hovers around 104 million people from 18 to 60 (not counting full-time students), it is clear that non-campus facilities will bear the brunt of the load.

How has the American college and university gone about using non-campus facilities to carry out its programs? EFL has checked with 75 institutions that have used non-campus facilities in one of four classifications.

1. The Dispersed Campus

A dispersed campus operates in several leased or rent-free facilities in the surrounding community. Sometimes

there is no campus at all. For example, Wayne County (Mich.) Community College lost several bond issues to build new facilities and began to hold evening classes in local high schools. The first year (1968), the administration expected 2,000 students to register and 6,000 showed up.

In a sense, Wayne County Community College is the ultimate in dispersed campuses, with all the assets and drawbacks of this flexible phenomenon. For facilities, WCCC rented space for classes wherever they could be reached most easily from students' homes or places of work.

The list of properties in use reads like a real estate directory. They include public high schools, middle schools, a parochial school, a Jewish Community Center, the downtown YWCA, part of a shopping center (later abandoned), space in hospitals, a housing project, youth homes.

The college is tied to these facilities only for the length of the leases. These are short-term, so a program can be dropped without leaving classrooms empty. An initial 56 centers was cut back to 27 as the concept was fine-tuned in the face of experience, improved management, vandalism in some centers, and program changes.

Administration is never easy in a multi-unit college. At WCCC, instructional centers (headed by a coordinator or teacher) are linked quite successfully through a modest central office. A dean of administration is in charge of scheduling; a director of facilities handles day-to-day operations and financial arrangements.

One endemic problem of the dispersed campus is the lack of college level science labs. Vocational high schools, hospitals and, in some cases, industry, balk for fear their lab facilities will be misused. Donated equipment tends to be outdated. Access to books and audiovisual resources is subject to similar constraints.

An unusual setting for a dispersed campus is the Flathead Valley Community College in Kalispell, Mont. A close-knit community, Kalispell's citizens decided to put together a "campus" of leased, rent-free and purchased buildings. They bought an Elks building for central administrative space and student social areas, and a former auto showroom for classrooms.

Space is leased in lodge buildings, and rent-free space has been provided at a railroad depot, VFW Hall and a 4H building. About $24,000 has been used in remodelling the owned buildings. For the rest, Flathead Valley has been able to schedule everything from classroom and art instruction to forestry labs, physical education and nursing training.

Other examples are documented in EFL's file of case studies. Malcolm-King Harlem College Extension, for instance, uses Harlem schools and an office building for teaching 95 courses to 750 students and working adults. El Paso Community College, Colorado Springs, is building up a space inventory throughout a six-block area of town with short-term leases from one to six years.

2. Community Facilities

Community facilities as outreach centers differ from the dispersed campus chiefly in that the educational programs and services of the outreach centers are deliberately focused on specific groups in the community, such as military or prisons.

Outreach centers can serve many purposes: veterans' counselling, university extension courses, adult-continuing education, health care training programs, high school equivalency training. All kinds of facilities are grist to the outreach mill. Seattle Community College District runs specialized programs in a downtown church, union halls, the county jail, and an old hotel turned hospital. A ship is used for a program to study Pacific cultures at Chapman College, Orange, Calif. Store fronts in the Linden, N.J., ghetto are used by Rutgers University for high school equivalency training.

Other outreach programs are not only innovative but could trigger similar programs elsewhere in the nation. One such project is the New Jersey Prison Program. Known as P.E.N. (for Prison Education Network), it has since 1971 been offering associate degrees to 500 students in classes at seven of New Jersey's prisons.

Mercer County Community College has coordinated the project, which takes place within the prisons. Two-thirds of the classes are live; the other third is via television. A special electrowriter-telelecturer system allows simultaneous lectures to go to several institutions. A bus has been adapted as a mobile science lab at a cost (including the bus) of $22,000. The program is paid for by the New Jersey Department of Higher Education and with FTE funds from the college.

One of the most underdeveloped channels for off-campus outreach programs is the public library. An ambitious effort to make up lost ground is the Dallas Public Library Independent Study Project. The Dallas public library signed a contract in 1971 with Southern Methodist University to provide a means for adults to get college credits through self-education.

SMU furnished study guides and faculty assistance, and administered exams. But all facilities belonged to the public library—with five branches used as resource centers.

The pilot project cost $100,000 over two years. The money came from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Council on Library Resources and the College Entrance Examination Board. Jean Brooks, director of the project, and David Reich have written a book on this theme, entitled "The Public Library in Nontraditional Education."

Planning for Higher Education Vol. 3, No. 2: 2/6 April 1974 Published in cooperation with Educational Facilities Laboratories, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

Lacking the funds to build a teaching hospital for a new school of medical sciences, the University of Nevada at Reno arranged with six hospitals throughout Nevada to provide space and equipment for educational functions and staff supervision. This scheme not only fell in with the philosophy of the school, which called for increased contacts with the community, but also gave students early practical experience with patients.

The military, too, have been the target of outreach efforts. In Honolulu, Chaminade College offers regular college programs at eight military posts (as well as two

Flathead Valley Community College has leased an 1894 former junior high school (above) to house its offices. A Burlington Northern Line depot (below) owned by the City of Kalispell, Mont. is home to College's art center (Photos courtesy Flathead Valley Community College).

hospitals). A mobile office registers students, collects fees and sells books and supplies.

3. External Degree Programs

External degree programs, as distinct from the dispersed campus and outreach approaches, require few formal facilities. Students are given credit chiefly for independent study. Whether they are reached through personal contact and correspondence, or by electronic means (as discussed later in this article), the student's space needs are largely accommodated at his home, place of work or public facilities in the community.

External degree programs have been categorized by New York's Empire State College as follows:

a. Formal courses offered by colleges, industries, unions, and community agencies.
b. Cooperative studies which arise when students share a similar interest and want to create a group to coordinate activities, share resources and experiences, or create a common outcome.
c. Tutorials.
d. Organized programs of more or less self-contained resources such as correspondence courses, programmed learning materials and televised instruction.
e. Direct experiences such as travel, observations, field work, paid employment, and volunteer activities, which may be supervised or unsupervised, and which become the object of examination and reflection by the student.
f. Independent studies, which usually call for a series of readings and writings, and which may also include direct experiences as described above.

These categories have been translated into programs in a number of innovative plans under way from coast to coast. Minnesota Metropolitan State College at St. Paul has since 1971 offered a bachelor's degree, and by 1975 expects to reach 1,500 enrolled students. Most of the current 500 students work full-time, and their average age is 33. Students receive credit for "observation and participation in everyday life situations," as well as for independent study. For the occasional seminar and orientation meetings, the few facilities are used or rented on an as-needed basis from a list of about 100 places. These include a community resource center, the space in an ETV station and in commercial and professional offices. Otherwise, learning goes on at museums, hospitals, factories, a political campaign headquarters, or at home.

Aside from a central office in Montpelier, the Community College of Vermont has no facilities, either built or leased. Instead, a network of 600 lay teachers reaches low-income, nontraditional learners in existing facilities for small-group lectures, experiential learning and by monitoring independent studies.

Another approach has been developed in the San Francisco area, with its compact scale, urban character [illegible] erse educational student goals. The San Francisco field center of Antioch College's University Without Walls program pulls together the program's various independent study and internship projects in the Bay area. These external degree programs focus on problems of planning and improving the environment. The center's only facility is the third floor of a converted warehouse. This is a large (7,000 sq. ft.) open space divided as needed to accommodate offices and some social space.

No review of facilities for external degree programs would be complete without referring to Empire State College. ESC relies on the facilities of the State University of New York (of which it is a part), and also draws on a community's space resources. Its enrollment since 1971 totals 1,800 students.

4. Technology-Based Programs

Like more conventional external programs, technology-based outreach programs transmit education over distances. But there are three big differences:

- Space is needed from which to beam programs.
- Space is needed to receive programs.
- Capital is needed to pay for equipment at both ends.

On the other hand, there are great advantages to electronic instruction. For one thing, it is possible to transmit instantly the real appearance of objects, experiments, book illustrations and documents.

Second, it is equally simple to transmit sound—whether of music, poetry, the instructor's voice and inflections.

Third, students, whether at home or at a receiving center, often are able to see an actual class in progress, with all the added interest and incentives this brings.

Fourth, the distances reached can be very great—even global.

Fifth, students can record transmissions for later use or repeated learning.

Instructional technology has met opposition. Some objections are based on lack of social acceptance. Skeptics fear dehumanization of the learning process, centralized control, faculty unemployment, poorly developed software, and unknown legal implications.

Other objections are to the investment in equipment and the even higher costs of developing software. There are also hidden management costs.

But acceptance is growing among faculty and students, as indicated by the rising number of programs. Especially important is cooperation among several institutions so as to share initial capital and overhead costs. Regional networks exist; these are administered by the state, by joint ventures of institutions, or by industry interested in continuing education for employees.

A number of cases of instructional technology for off-campus programs has been documented by EFL. One such system was approved in 1970 by the Oklahoma State Legislature. It consists of a closed-circuit, "talk-back" method designed to deliver higher education to remote communities and industries.

The Oklahoma system now embraces 14 institutions

and four fee-paying industries. It transmits college courses for credit, as well as conferences. Seven institutions act as transmitting stations and use regular classrooms. There are 15 receiving classrooms throughout the state—at community colleges, universities, business offices and one state prison. Initial capital investment was $1,250,000.

A privately developed system is Stanford University's Instructional TV Network. Since 1969, a 4-channel low-power education TV network has beamed live graduate courses, chiefly in engineering and business, to receiving classrooms provided by industry in the San Francisco Bay area. An FM radio system allows students to talk to the instructor on the Stanford campus.

Two other cases illustrate the variations possible in this approach. One of the largest systems is the TV College of the City Colleges of Chicago. It uses open rather than closed-circuit transmission. Since it began in 1956, it has had some 215,000 course registrations (about half of them for credit), and the program reaches an added estimated 280,000 viewers. TV College has no production facilities, but leases these from the local Public Broadcast station (WTTW). The only other space used full time is a staff office located in a commercial office building.

Students receive televised lectures at home. Classrooms for exams, lab sessions and conferences are provided at off-hours at four branch campuses of the City Colleges. In addition, students may also study at four branches of the Chicago Public Library. TV College faculty members are stationed at the branches to counsel students, and the course lectures are available on videocassettes.

The second example is an industry oriented network that interconnects nine colleges and universities with a small group of blue-chip corporations that have offices or plants in a 2,000-sq-mile area of North Texas. The network is known as TAGER, The Association for Graduate Education and Research.[1] TAGER began in 1967 at a time when highly trained technical people were scarce in the area. Industry was ready to support a system that enabled employees to study for a further degree without losing time from work. All classes are live and talk back enables students at any remote classroom to ask questions of the professor and participate directly in the class. All other students in the network hear these questions and may join in discussions.

Production facilities are in regular classrooms. Receiving facilities for the highly specialized courses are in other classrooms of member colleges or at member industries.

As these and similar cases show, space is important but seldom entails new construction. Even remodelling is minor. Production, support and storage may be in vacant space on campus, unless the facilities of a local TV station can be used. Receiving sets are in classrooms in the colleges, or off-campus in schools, prisons, hospitals, offices and at home.

Planning Considerations

The isolated or walled-off campus is a thing of the past. Today, many colleges not only send their students off-campus for internships and field experience (see 'Redeploying Campus Space and Time'), but also reach out into their communities and regions with educational and public service programs for nontraditional students: adults, working people, the elderly and dropouts.

When considering such programs several important planning issues must be faced. These include:

- Surveys of demand for different types of education programs in an area (credit, non-credit, technological retraining, ethnic studies, etc.).
- An inventory of resources of an institution in providing such courses (faculty interest, library resources).
- Inventories of other programs in the area at other institutions, community and church organizations, and proprietary institutions (a growing competitor) to avoid duplication.
- A search for unused or underused facilities throughout the community that would be safe and accessible for class meetings.

Timing is as important as finding facilities. Programs for working people are most attractive if scheduled in the evening, or for only two meetings per week. Coordination of effort between a home campus and outreach center must be worked out. The use of part-time or adjunct faculty who work as well as teach has been found useful.

The costs of running outreach programs vary, although generally the costs of continuing education programs are similar to conventional ones. Some nontraditional forms of continuing education have cost less than others, such as Community College of Vermont, and Minnesota Metropolitan State College. But salaries for counselors are high, and most new programs are subsidized. Instructional technology faces high capital costs, which will be offset only by economies of scale.

The major problem of outreach programs lies in administration and management. While a decentralized plan may be beneficial in limiting the size of a central bureaucracy, there is the problem of integration of services and reduced visibility.

Specialized facilities such as labs and library resources are not as available as classes and seminars. Communication among students and among students and faculty/administration are harder, as there are fewer fixed meeting times and places. Many have proposed satellite centers with lounges, offices, a learning resource center, in order to retain, albeit on a new and transformed basis, some of the coherence and community of a traditional institution.

-Stephen A. Kliment
Jane Lord

[1] Morisseau, James J., "TAGER: The Electronic Consortium," Planning For Higher Education, Vol. II No. 5: 3/4, October, 1973 reports the story of TAGER's origins and operations.